



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,602	07/08/2005	Wouter Van Praag	VANP3003/JJC/PMB	6667

23364 7590 03/04/2009
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176

EXAMINER

COMLEY, ALEXANDER BRYANT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3746

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/04/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed February 2nd, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner's responses can be seen below.
2. In regards to Applicant's argument that there is a three-way solenoid valve disposed in communication line 16, the Examiner must assert that line 15 was utilized in the office action as "a first pipe" that is connected to the first cylinder chamber of the inlet valve and a rotor chamber of the compressor. As shown in Figure 1 of Suzuki, there are, in fact, no valve devices disposed in line 15, thereby meeting the claim limitation "always open". Furthermore, in regards to Applicant's argument that line 15 is not connected to a working chamber of the cylinder, the Examiner must respectfully disagree. The pipe 15 can be seen connected to chamber opening 9Ac, which is part of the working chamber 9A. And finally, in regards to Applicant's arguments about which lines are "near the inlet valve" and which are not, the Examiner must assert that any communication line connected to the inlet valve is inherently "near the inlet valve".
3. In regards to Applicant's argument that the Ott reference fails to disclose a gas stream limiter disposed within a bridge, the Examiner must respectfully disagree. As shown in Figure 1 of Ott, a check valve 13 is disposed in the bridge, thereby "limiting" the gas stream therethrough. The Examiner must assert that the term "gas stream limiter" fails to particularly define any structure thereto, and therefore, any valve device that limits flow (in either direction) constitutes a "gas stream limiter". Moreover, the

Art Unit: 3746

check valve 11 is clearly shown disposed on suction line 2, which forms part of the bridge 12.

4. In regards to Applicant's argument that the relief passages 46A and 46B of Tsuchida do not extend over the entire length of the valve stem, the Examiner must respectfully disagree. As shown best in Figure 2A of Tsuchida, the passages 46A and 46B do, in fact, extend axially along the length of the stem 35. Moreover, the Examiner contests that the relief passages of Tsuchida would not destroy the function of Suzuki, since it is the annular head portions of the valve stem that provide the primary valving function thereof. Adding the passages of Tsuchida to the Suzuki stem would produce a valve stem like that of Figure 4 of Applicant's drawings.